REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated February 8, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are currently pending. No new matter is added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2-4 are objected to because of claim informalities. Applicant herein amends claim 2 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection..

Also, claims 1, 5-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,127,330 to Okazaki et al. (hereinafter "Okazaki"). Claims 2-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okazaki, as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 10, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,662,041 to Kleist (hereinafter "Kleist"). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okazaki, as applied to claims 1, 5-7 and 10, in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0109799 to Choi et al. (hereinafter "Choi"). Claims 1, 5-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0084796 to Kwon et al. (hereinafter "Kwon"). Claims 2-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwon in view of Kleist. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwon in view of Choi.

The rejection of claims 1, 5-7 and 10 as being unpatentable over Okazaki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over Okazaki in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a second groove structure having a second width divided into multiples of the first width and an interval therebetween...wherein the interval is determined by viscosity

and surface energy of the resist material." Okazaki does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner states on page 4 of the Office Action that "it would have been obvious...to provide a cliché having first and second groove structures with the size relationship as recited, as the particular sizes and arrangements of the groove structures...are dependent upon such factors as the particular configuration...the desired thickness...the viscosity of the material...." However, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching or suggestion in the prior art that "the interval is determined by viscosity and surface energy of the resist material." Thus, the Examiner is requested to provide adequate evidence of the statements on page 4 of the Office Action. As instructed by MPEP 2144.03(A), "assertions of specific knowledge of the prior art must always be supported by citation to some reference work recognized as standard in the pertinent art. *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091 (CCPA 1970)." Thus, because Okazaki is silent with respect to how the interval is determined, there is no teaching or suggestion in Okazaki that "the interval is determined by viscosity and surface energy of the resist material." Accordingly, because Okazaki fails to teach this feature of claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 5-7 and 10, which depend therefrom, are allowable over Okazaki.

The rejection of claims 2-4 and 11-12 as being unpatentable over Okazaki in view of Kleist is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

With respect to claims 2-4, Applicant respectfully submits that Kleist fails to cure the aforementioned defects associated with Okazaki. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests "a second groove structure having a second width divided into multiples of the first width and an interval therebetween...wherein the interval is determined by viscosity and surface energy of the resist material," as recited in independent claim 1. For at least this reason, claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Furthermore, claims 11 and 12 are allowable over Okazaki in view of Kleist in that each claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "the second groove structure having a second width divided into multiples of the first width and an interval therebetween, wherein the interval is determined by viscosity and surface energy of the resist material." None

of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. As stated above, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching or suggestion in the prior art that "the interval is determined by viscosity and surface energy of the resist material." Okazaki is silent with respect to how the interval is determined. Kleist does not cure the deficiencies of Okazaki. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 8 and 9 as being unpatentable over Okazaki in view of Choi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Choi fails to cure the aforementioned defects associated with Okazaki. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests "a second groove structure having a second width divided into multiples of the first width and an interval therebetween...wherein the interval is determined by viscosity and surface energy of the resist material," as recited in independent claim 1. For at least this reason, claims 8 and 9, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 1, 5-8 and 10 as being unpatentable over Kwon is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner states on pages 7 and 8 of the last Office Action that Applicant failed to provide a statement that the application and the reference were commonly owned at the time the invention was made. The present invention is assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 14739, frame 430. The filing date of the present invention was November 24, 2003 and the assignment was recorded on November 24, 2003. Kwon is also assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 13744, frame 983. This assignment was recorded on February 7, 2003. Thus, the present invention and Kwon were commonly owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. at the time the invention was made. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Kwon cannot be applied as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), against claims 1, 5-8 and 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 5-8 and 10 are allowable over Kwon.

The rejection of claims 2-4 and 11-12 as being unpatentable over Kwon in view of Kleist is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present invention is assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 14739, frame 430. The filing date of the present invention was November 24, 2003 and the assignment was recorded on November 24, 2003. Kwon is also assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 13744, frame 983. This assignment was recorded on February 7, 2003. Thus, the present invention and Kwon were commonly owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. at the time the invention was made. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Kwon cannot be applied as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), against claims 2-4, 11 and 12. Therefore, as Kleist by itself is insufficient to reject claims 2-4, 11 and 12, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 11 and 12 are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 9 as being unpatentable over Kwon in view of Choi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present invention is assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 14739, frame 430. The filing date of the present invention was November 24, 2003 and the assignment was recorded on November 24, 2003. Kwon is also assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 13744, frame 983. This assignment was recorded on February 7, 2003. Thus, the present invention and Kwon were commonly owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. at the time the invention was made. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. §103(c), Kwon cannot be applied as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), against claim 9. Therefore, as Choi by itself is insufficient to reject claim 9, Applicant respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps

necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: May 4, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant